

Draft Decision Notice and
Finding of No Significant Impact

DOG RIVER PIPELINE REPLACEMENT

USDA Forest Service
Mt. Hood National Forest
Barlow Ranger District
Wasco County, Oregon

This draft decision notice is made available with the Environmental Assessment for the Dog River Pipeline Replacement Project pursuant to 36 CFR 218.7(b). The Dog River Pipeline Replacement Environmental Assessment (EA) contains an in-depth discussion of the setting, ecological processes, resource conditions, the purpose and need for action, the proposed action designed to achieve the purpose and need, project design criteria, alternatives considered, the effects and benefits of those alternatives and appendices, which include a discussion of comments received. This draft decision notice incorporates by reference the Dog River Pipeline Replacement EA, as well as the resource specialist reports and/or analyses used to support the summary of effects discussed in the EA.

This project is located in T1S, R10E, section 34 and T2S, R10E, sections 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, Willamette Meridian. All section number references are to sections of the EA unless specified otherwise. The EA can be found on the [Forest's website](#). Acres and miles are approximate since they are derived from GIS. The Mt. Hood National Forest is referred to as 'the Forest' in this document. The Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1990) and standards and guidelines, as amended, are referred to as 'the Forest Plan' in this document.

This draft decision notice documents my proposed decision and rationale for the selection of the proposed action alternative for the Dog River Pipeline Replacement Project.

Purpose and Need (Section 1.3)

The purpose of this project is to replace the existing Dog River pipeline. There is a need for action because the pipeline has become so deteriorated that it no longer provides the most efficient way of conveying water to the City of The Dalles municipal water supply to continue to fulfill the commitment under an existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Draft Decision to Select the Proposed Action Alternative

I have reviewed the EA and the information contained in the project file. I have consulted with Kameron Sam, Barlow District Ranger, who has managed this project for many years. I have also reviewed and considered the public comments submitted on this project (see Appendix A of EA for response to comments). I have determined that there is adequate information to make a reasoned decision. **I have decided that I will select the proposed action alternative.** The proposed action is described in detail in Section 2.2 of the EA.

The proposed action is the replacement of the existing pipeline with a new pipeline, allowing the City of The Dalles to utilize more efficiently the water being diverted from Dog River. The existing 3.4 mile antiquated pipeline would be abandoned in place. A seam-sealed 24-inch-

diameter pipe would be constructed parallel and next to the existing alignment as much as possible. The existing pipeline would continue to be used to convey water to South Fork Mill Creek until the new pipeline is constructed.

In addition to pipeline replacement, the project would repair and improve the diversion structure and install fish screens and a fish passage structure. A new culvert would also be constructed under the service road (Forest Service Road (FSR) 1700-014) that crosses Brooks Meadow Creek to provide passage for aquatic organisms. Summer low flows in lower Dog River would be improved by adding 0.5 cubic feet per second (cfs) bypass flow below the point of diversion during August, September, and October. Implementation of the proposed action would include best management practices (BMPs) and project design criteria (PDCs), which are discussed in the following section, to minimize effects to natural and cultural resources. Any necessary updates to the special use permit would occur prior to operation of the new pipeline.

Existing trees and dead wood would be cut and removed within a 25-foot corridor. Approximately 438 live trees ranging in size from six to 48 inches diameter at breast height (DBH) would be removed. Of these 438 trees, approximately twelve trees are larger than 24 inches DBH, 170 trees are between 12 and 14 inches DBH, and the remaining trees are 11 inches DBH and smaller. In addition to the live trees, approximately 198 standing dead trees would be cut. Of these, over half are between 11 and 20 inches DBH, roughly three dead trees are over 30 inches DBH, 22 dead trees are between 20 to 30 inches DBH, and the remainder of the dead standing trees are under 11 inches DBH.

A trench for the pipeline would be excavated and would be approximately 4-feet deep by 3 to 4-feet wide. Spoils would be stockpiled to either side of the trench to be used to re-bury and cover the trench after the pipe has been laid in the ground. Gravel and/or sand would be brought to the trench and staged within reach for use as bedding and backfill. The pipe would be placed on top of the bedding emplaced in the bottom of the trench. Then the trench and pipe would be backfilled and overlaid with more gravel and/or sand before being buried and covered using the removed spoils. The pipe inlet, discharge structure, and flow measuring facilities would also be replaced. The construction corridor would be accessed along the existing service road (FSR 1700-014) and would avoid operating over the old pipeline. Where the pipeline intersects Brooks Meadow Creek, it would be buried under the stream and the channel over it would be restored.

FSR 1700-014 would be used as the main access for the length of the pipeline. This road is currently a rough, native and gravel surface, single-lane road that crosses Brooks Meadow Creek at an unimproved ford. The project would first install a cement prefabricated open box culvert that would provide passage for aquatic organisms prior to pipeline construction, eliminating the need for a ford crossing. During the construction, the stream would be re-routed around the work area as the culvert is being installed using a temporary bypass line. During construction activities, FSR 1700-014 would be temporarily closed to the public.

There are several staging areas identified for use during the construction period. The main one-acre staging area would be located along the FSR 1700-014 west of the crossing at Brooks Meadow Creek, and would accommodate the transport of pipe to the construction corridor. It would also act as a temporary storage area for the trees and logs removed from the corridor.

Minor realignment of FSR 1700-014 between Brooks Meadow Creek and the main staging area would be completed to allow for construction vehicle traffic. There are several other locations identified for storing pipe, gravel, and sand: 1) on either side of FSR 1700-691 where it intersects with FSR 1700-690; 2) along FSR 4400-011 at the junction with FSR 4400; or, 3) at an old landing off of FSR 1700. Gravel and sand may also be stored at the junction of FSRs 1700 and 1700-680 roads. All of the staging areas would be rehabilitated upon completion of the project.

The new pipeline would continue to be maintained and operated as it conventionally has for many decades, conveying water diverted from upper Dog River to South Fork Mill Creek for municipal use by the City of The Dalles in accordance with existing state and federal authorizations. Pipeline operations would remain unchanged. In most years, the headworks at the pipeline inlet would be operated to increase diverted flow in the late fall and early winter to re-fill Crow Creek reservoir, typically by early or mid-February. Once full, the amount of diversion would be reduced to a maintenance flow that would supplement South Fork Mill Creek and contribute to storage in order to meet variations in seasonal demand.

Draft Decision Rationale

The existing Dog River pipeline, which was constructed in the early 20th century, consists of milled pieces of fir wrapped with wire and coated with tar. Over the past 100 years, this pipe has deteriorated, is leaking, and is no longer conveying water efficiently. Because the pipe is in poor condition, the City of The Dalles needs to replace the antiquated pipeline to continue to provide water to its residents. Recognizing the importance this pipeline plays in providing the public with drinking water, I believe my decision to select the proposed action adequately addresses the need to update the pipeline as described in Section 1.3 of the EA. I have selected the proposed action because I believe that it honors existing water rights, while providing the best balance in biological and cultural concerns. Additionally, the proposed action is consistent with the Forest Plan's management objectives and meets agreements the Forest Service has had with the City for over 100 years.

As stated above, my decision is partly based on the water rights associated with Dog River. I understand water rights was a concern raised during the comment period, so I would like to explain my understanding of these rights. First, the Forest Service does not administer or regulate water rights; rather this is the responsibility of the State of Oregon's Water Resources Department (OWRD). Therefore, I see it as my responsibility to defer to OWRD's expertise to ensure compliance with Oregon's water laws that pertain to municipal use. Second, my staff has communicated with OWRD staff to understand that the City's water right is senior to any federally reserved water rights on the Mt. Hood National Forest. The City's water right for Dog River has a priority date of 1870, and its water right for the South Fork of Mill Creek has a priority date of 1862. Both pre-date the Organic Act and the establishment of the Mt. Hood National Forest. Therefore, my decision to replace the pipeline is based on honoring the City's existing use and rights for Dog River.

Another consideration I took into account is that The City does not need a larger pipeline to take more water. They could take more water with the existing old pipeline. According to City records, it has been rare that enough flow has been diverted to completely fill the existing

pipeline. Also, the City is not proposing to change their pipeline operations and divert more water from Dog River. They currently divert enough water from Dog River to meet their needs.

Another concern raised during the development of this EA involves the potential effects on fish and fish habitat listed under the Endangered Species Act. I share this concern, and so I tasked my staff to take another hard look at the proposed action's effects to aquatics. Ultimately, my staff's analysis found impacts to fish and fish habitat to be insignificant because the new pipe is unlikely to negatively affect water quality and instream flow. Also, fish habitat will not get dewatered as a result of replacing the pipe. A biological assessment was submitted to the NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for the effects to Lower Columbia River (LCR) steelhead and LCR coho and their designated critical habitat, as well as critical habitat for LCR Chinook salmon. It was determined that replacing the pipe is *not likely to adversely affect* listed species or critical habitat. For these reasons, my decision to proceed with the proposed action is based on my understanding that effects to aquatic species and habitat are discountable.

The Forest Plan's management direction also provides some of my reasoning for selecting the proposed action. The land use allocation for the area of the pipeline is designated as a Special Emphasis Watershed (B6) with the goal of managing water quality for municipal uses. This management direction was also reinforced by the designation of area as The Dalles Municipal Watershed in 1972. Because much of the municipal water supply originates from federal lands, there has been a long standing recognition for the Forest Service to maintain and protect the waters originating from the National Forest System lands to support the local communities. Therefore, my decision to select the proposed action is also supported by management direction outlined in the Forest Plan, as well as continued agreements with the City of The Dalles.

Public Involvement (Section 1.5)

A scoping letter was shared with the public in 2011. One commenter responded. A second scoping letter was sent to the public in March 2016. The project was listed in the Mt. Hood National Forest quarterly planning newsletter (Schedule of Proposed Action [SOPA]) as an ongoing project since spring 2016. Five commenters responded during the second public scoping period. Scoping comments and responses are included in the project record.

In August 2016, there was a field trip to the project area, which included Forest Service staff and representatives from the NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), City of The Dalles, and the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs. The intent of this field trip was to discuss issues and understand the City's operation of the pipeline and diversion.

A Preliminary Environmental Assessment was published on November 10, 2018 and a 30-day comment period concluded on December 10, 2018. Five commenters responded. Comments and responses are included in Appendix A of the EA. After the comment period ended, Forest Service staff met with the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs (February 2019) and a representative from the City of The Dalles (March 2019). The purpose of these meetings was to discuss project concerns and next steps in anticipation of developing this EA.

Comments and meetings resulted in increased clarification and greater depth of analysis in the

EA. Many comments concerned water rights, the City's plans for future water use, the current pipeline and seepage (water loss), and fish and fish habitat. I considered the comments received and I believe that the proposed action is both appropriate and consistent with relevant management direction and that the EA clearly explains the effects and benefits. I find that the science used to develop the project and to assess the effects is current and valid. I believe my decision balances the need for these actions against impacts to resources, and I have incorporated adequate project design criteria (Section 2.3) to minimize impacts to resources and that those impacts have been thoroughly disclosed in the EA.

While I respect the opinions of commenters and appreciate the dialogue that has occurred, I do not consider any of the comments received to warrant the generation of any additional fully-developed alternatives. However, the comments received from the public did result in further refinement for the proposed action, as well as additional analyses. First, the proposed action has been updated to include that the City of The Dalles will provide 0.5 cubic feet per second (cfs) bypass flow below the point of diversion during August, September, and October, instead of only in September and October as described in the Preliminary EA. Second, additional data were considered and further analyses were conducted for the hydrology and fisheries reports. Additional data included stream flow records from the City of The Dalles, USGS, USFS, and OWRD for Dog River, the South Fork of Mill Creek, and the Crow Creek reservoir. The Mt. Hood National Forest also collected data over the spring through summer of 2019. This additional information provided a more comprehensive disclosure of effects outlined in Sections 3.3 and 3.4. Also, consultation with the NMFS was completed, which included all new and supplemental data. Lastly, project design criterion were refined to better protect cultural and natural resources.

Other Alternatives Considered (Section 2.2.1)

The no-action alternative (Section 2.1) was not selected because it would not provide any of the benefits described in the purpose and need. If no action is taken, the existing pipeline would remain in place and would continue to degrade and leak. Additionally, the current diversion would remain in place, and no fish screens or diversion structures would be installed. This diversion would continue to serve as a barrier to aquatic and semi-aquatic fish passage.

In the long term, the pipeline would continue to degrade and would likely lose additional water as growing vegetation would continue to compromise the integrity of the wooden pipeline. At some point, the pipeline may suffer a catastrophic failure and no longer provide the City of The Dalles with this portion of their municipal water supply.

Finding of No Significant Impact (40 CFR 1508.27)

Based on the site-specific environmental analysis documented in the EA and the comments received from the public, I have determined that this is not a major Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment; therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed. This determination is based on my consideration of the context and intensity of the proposed action and its effects.

Context

Based on the documentation in the EA and project file, I have determined the following with regard to the context of this project:

The EA is consistent with direction set forth in the Forest Plan, as amended. The Forest is comprised of about 1.1 million acres; the proposed action authorizes removal of about 438 trees on the Barlow Ranger District, which equates to less than one percent of the Forest. Under the proposed action, The City of The Dalles would continue to exercise their water rights and divert water for municipal use as they currently are. Given the area affected by the project and that there would be no change in water rights, I find that the effects of the project are not significant as disclosed throughout chapter 3 of the EA and will have a negligible effect at the forest scale.

Intensity

1. My finding of no significant environmental effect is not biased by the beneficial effects of the action. Impacts can be both beneficial and adverse. For this project, there are no known long-term adverse effects or cumulative effects to resources such as water quality, soils, riparian areas, fish, wildlife or heritage resources. Effects to these resources are documented in chapter 3 of the EA.
2. The project contains project design criteria and mitigation measures to protect public health and safety during project implementation. Examples include measures to ensure safe passage for vehicles on specific roads (Section 2.3.2) temporary trail closures (Section 2.3.5) and development of public information materials (Section 2.3.5).
3. There would be no significant effects on unique features in the area, such as historical or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. The project is not located in park lands or prime farmland. There are no wild and scenic rivers in the project area. Wet meadows, riparian areas, historic and cultural resources will be protected (Section 2.2.3). See also the description for protection of wetlands and floodplains under “Other Findings Required by Law or Regulation” below.
4. The effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial.
5. The possible effects on the human environment are not highly uncertain, nor do they involve unique or unknown risks. The effects analyses discussed in chapter 3 of the EA are based on sound scientific research.
6. The action is not likely to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects because this action is not unusual in and of itself, nor does it lead to any further actions that are unique.
7. Each of the resource sections in chapter 3 of the EA addressed potential cumulative effects. Effects discussions for hydrology (Section 3.3.2) and fisheries and aquatics fauna

(Section 3.4.2), in addition to the letter of concurrence received from NMFS (April 2020) are particularly relevant to this FONSI. This action does not represent potential significant cumulative impacts when considered in combination with other past or reasonably foreseeable actions.

8. The action would have no significant adverse effect on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and would not cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources (Section 3.10).
9. My decision is consistent with the Endangered Species Act.

A biological assessment (BA) was submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for the effects to northern spotted owls. A Biological Opinion (USFWS Reference Number 01EOW00-2017-F-0045 and 17-14) was received in August 2017 with a determination that this project was likely to adversely affect (LAA) northern spotted owls. This determination is because the proposed action includes removing large trees in suitable habitat (6.1 acres in suitable nesting habitat and 4.2 acres in dispersal habitat). However, it was also determined that habitat removal would not impact the ability of owls to utilize this habitat at the stand scale since the trees that would be removed are spread out across a long narrow corridor rather than in one patch. Also, the analysis concluded that the function of the habitat within each stand would remain unchanged (Wildlife Report, p. 9). Surveys have been conducted to protocol for the last 10 years along the pipeline and no spotted owls have been found. Therefore, no nesting owls would be impacted by the habitat removal.

A BA was submitted to NMFS for the effects to federally listed species including LCR steelhead and LCR coho, as well as their designated critical habitat, as well as LCR Chinook salmon critical habitat. A Letter of Concurrence (NMFS No: WCRO-2019-03627) was received on April 13, 2020 concurring that the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect (NLAA) the subject listed species and designated critical habitats.

10. My decision will not violate Federal, state, and local laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. The action is consistent with the Forest Plan (Section 1.5.1). The selected alternative is consistent with the National Forest Management Act regulations. The project complies with Executive Order 12898 regarding environmental justice. No disproportionately high adverse human or environmental effects on minorities and/or low-income populations were identified during the analysis or public scoping process.

Other Findings Required by Law or Regulation

Clean Air Act: My decision is consistent with the Clean Air Act. Burning will be scheduled in conjunction with the State of Oregon to comply with the Oregon Smoke Implementation Plan to minimize the adverse effects on air quality (Section 3.14).

Clean Water Act: The Clean Water Act of 1948 (as amended in 1972 and 1987) establishes as federal policy to control point and non-point pollution and assigns the States the primary

responsibility for control of water pollution. Detrimental effects to water quality and quantity will be avoided, minimized, or mitigated through implementation of project design criteria and best management practices (BMP) prescribed for the proposed action. Project design criteria and best management practices are listed in chapter 2 of the EA.

Protection of Wetlands and Floodplains-Executive Order 11990: There are no jurisdictional floodplains or wetlands within the project area as per Executive Order 11988. There would be very limited impacts to non-jurisdictional floodplains or wetlands from this project. Due to the steepness of the topography, small stream size and confined nature of streams in this area, floodplain width is fairly limited. Section 3.14.2 of the EA discusses wetlands and floodplains, and relevant information can also be found in the hydrology section (3.3) and fisheries section (3.4). Due to the PDC and BMPs which are aimed at minimizing the impacts to wetlands and floodplains (Section 2.3), there would be minimal direct and indirect effects. The proposed action would be consistent with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Endangered Species Act (ESA): Consultation has been completed for the northern spotted owl and listed fish species. Consultation was not required for botanical species since there are no listed botanical species within the project area. Listed species are addressed in the EA in chapter 3. Biological opinions from NMFS and USFWS, as discussed above, are included in the project record.

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act: The project is consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (amended 1996) required designation of Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for Chinook and coho salmon. The Dog River and East Fork Hood River Basins (HUC 17070105) are designated as Chinook and coho salmon EFH. Although both species have been documented in the EFH and lower Dog River, EFH would not be adversely affected by the project since project effects would be ameliorated within the distance from the intake structure downstream to their known occurrence.

National Forest Management Act: The proposed action was developed to be in full compliance with the National Forest Management Act via compliance with the Forest Plan, as amended. Consistency with the Forest Plan is discussed in the following section.

National Historic Preservation Act: The Forest operates under a programmatic agreement between the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for consultation on project determination. Based on the proposed protective measures, the project meets the criteria in the Programmatic Agreement for “*No Historic Properties Adversely Affected*” determination (Stipulation III (B) 4) (section 3.10). Consultation with SHPO was completed for this project (project record, Heritage Resources, SHPO concurrence letter).

Consistency with Mt. Hood Forest Plan

I find that the selected alternative is consistent with direction found in the Forest Plan, as amended. It is consistent with standards and guidelines specific to the relevant land allocations and it is consistent with the applicable forestwide standards and guidelines. Consistency with

Forest Plan standards and guidelines is documented in each of the resource specialist reports (project record).

Aquatic Conservation Strategy – The project will contribute to maintaining or restoring aquatic conditions and is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives (Sections 3.3.3 and 3.4.3). I find that the project design criteria (Section 2.3) would minimize impacts and maintain the function of key watershed indicators that make up elements of the aquatic conservation strategy.

Management Indicator Species – I have considered the impacts to forest management indicator species (MIS). MIS for this portion of the Forest within the project area include deer and elk, pileated woodpecker, American marten, wild turkey, and Western gray squirrel. I find that the selected alternative is consistent with the standards and guidelines pertaining to management indicator species, and viable populations of all of these would be maintained at the Forest-scale (Section 3.6).

Invasive Plants – I find that the selected alternative is consistent with Pacific Northwest Invasive Plant Program Preventing and Managing Invasive Plants Record of Decision issued in 2005 and the site-specific invasive plant treatments for Mt. Hood National Forest Record of Decision issued in 2008 (Section 3.8). Design criteria are included to minimize the spread and establishment of invasive plants (Section 2.3).

Survey and Manage – I find that my decision complies with the 2001 Record of Decision and standards and guidelines for amendments to the survey and manage, protection buffer, and other mitigation measures standards and guidelines.

For aquatic species, Dalles juga are present in the project area where in-water activities will occur. The project may impact Dalles Juga individuals or habitat (MIIH). However, project actions will not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing since Dalles juga present in the immediate area will be relocated prior to in-water work as per PDC. Impacts are expected to be minimal and localized (Section 3.4.2.7).

There is no habitat within the project area for the seven survey and manage wildlife species, so they were not discussed further (project record, Wildlife Report, p. 4).

For botanical species, surveys were conducted and the proposed action is consistent with the survey protocols from the 2001 Survey and Manage Record of Decision. All botany surveys included consideration of botanical species in table C-3 of the 2001 Survey and Manage Record of Decision (EA section 3.7). No survey and manage species were found during field surveys, and no known sites were present in the project area.

Pre-decisional Administrative Review Summary

This project is subject to pre-decisional administrative review pursuant to 36 CFR 218, subpart B. Also called the “objection process.” The rule can be found at the [USDA website](#).

Only individuals or entities that submitted timely, specific written comments during a designated

opportunity for public participation (scoping or the 30-day public comment period) may object (36 CFR 218.5). Notices of objection must meet the requirements of 36 CFR 218.8. Objections must be filed with the objection reviewing officer within 45 days from the date of publication of notice of the opportunity to object in *The Oregonian*. The publication date is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an objection. Those wishing to file an objection to this draft decision should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source. Objections sent by U.S. Postal Service or other private carrier must be postmarked or date stamped before the close of the objection period and must be received before the close of the fifth business day after the objection filing period.

Incorporation of documents by reference is not allowed, except for the following list of items that may be referenced by including date, page, and section of the cited document, along with a description of its content and applicability to the objection: 1) all or any part of a Federal law or regulation; 2) Forest Service directives and land management plans; 3) documents referenced by the Forest Service in the subject environmental assessment; or 4) comments previously provided to the Forest Service by the objector during public involvement opportunities for the proposed project where written comments were requested by the responsible official. All other documents must be included with the objection.

Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted specific written comments regarding the proposed project or activity and attributed to the objector, unless the issue is based on new information that arose after the opportunities for comment. The burden is on the objector to demonstrate compliance with this requirement for objection issues.

Minimum requirements of an objection area described at 218.8(d). An objection must include a description of those aspects of the proposed project addressed by the objection, including specific issues related to the proposed project; if applicable, how the objector believes the environmental analysis or draft decision specifically violates law, regulation, or policy; suggested remedies that would resolve the objection; supporting reasons for the objection reviewing officer to consider; and a statement that demonstrates the connection between prior specific written comments on the particular proposed project or activity and the content of the objection, unless the objection concerns an issue that arose after the designated opportunities for comment.

The objection reviewing officer is the Regional Forester. Due to COVID-19, we request that objections be submitted via email. If you are unable to submit an objection electronically, then please use postal delivery.

Email: We strongly encourage you to submit objections electronically. Objections can be filed electronically at: **objections-pnw-regional-office@usda.gov**. Please put DOG RIVER OBJECTION in the subject line. Electronic objections must be submitted as part of an actual e-mail message, or as an attachment in Microsoft Word (.doc), rich text format (.rtf), or portable document format (.pdf) only. Emails submitted to addresses other than the ones listed above or in formats other than those listed above or containing viruses will be rejected. It is the responsibility of the objector to confirm receipt of objections submitted by electronic mail. For electronically mailed objections, the sender should normally receive an automated electronic acknowledgement

from the agency as confirmation of receipt. If the sender does not receive an automated acknowledgement of receipt, it is the sender's responsibility to ensure timely receipt by other means.

Mail: Objections can be mailed to the objection reviewing officer at the address below. Objections delivered by mail must be postmarked by the closing day of the objection filing period and received before close of the fifth business day following the end of the objection period.

Regional Forester (Objection Reviewing Officer)
Pacific Northwest Regional Office
Attn: 1570 Objections
P.O. Box 3623
Portland, OR 97208-3623

FedEx or UPS deliveries: Objections can also be submitted to the objection reviewing officer via FedEx or UPS delivery to the address below.

Regional Forester (Objection Reviewing Officer)
Pacific Northwest Regional Office
Attn: 1570 Objections
1220 SW Third Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

Hand-delivery/Fax: Objections cannot be hand-delivered or faxed at this time, due to the current COVID-19 pandemic and Executive Order by Governor Brown.

For further information regarding this project, contact Kameron Sam, Barlow District Ranger, at 541-467-5101 or by email at kameron.sam@usda.gov. The EA, this draft decision notice and maps can be downloaded from the Forest's website at: <https://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=34721>

Richard Periman

Date

Forest Supervisor
Mt. Hood National Forest

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotope, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at <https://www.ascr.usda.gov/filing-program-discrimination-complaint-usda-customer> and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.